



DRAFT MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes

HELD THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2009

The Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) for former Mare Island Naval Shipyard (MINSY) held its regular meeting on Thursday, May 28, 2009 at the Mare Island Conference Center, 375 G St., Vallejo, California. The meeting started at 7:03 p.m. and adjourned at 8:45 p.m. These minutes are a transcript of the discussions and presentations from the RAB Meeting. The following persons were in attendance.

RAB Community Members in attendance:

- Myrna Hayes (Community Co-Chair)
- Michael R. Coffey
- Wendell Quigley
- Paula Tygielski
- Chris Rasmussen

RAB Navy, Developers, Regulatory and Other Agency Members in attendance:

- Michael Bloom (Navy Co-Chair)
- Janet Lear (Navy)
- Heather Wochnick (Navy)
- Marie Dreyer (Navy)
- Gil Hollingsworth (City of Vallejo)
- Richard Perry (DTSC)
- Janet Naito (DTSC)
- Paisha Jorgensen (Water Board)
- John Kaiser (Water Board)
- Neal Siler (Lennar)
- Ed Aromi (CH2M Hill)
- Steve Farley (CH2M Hill)
- Dwight Gemar (Weston)

Community Guests in attendance:

- Diji Christian
- David McMurtry
- James Pollock
- Lester Rich
- Bill Stephens

RAB Support from CDM:

- Randa Chichakli
- Wally Neville (audio visual support)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. All right, everybody, we'll go ahead and get started. Welcome to the May, 2009 Mare Island RAB meeting. I'll start with introductions. I'm Michael Bloom, the Navy co-chair and BRAC environmental coordinator.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: And I'm Myrna Hayes, and I'm the community co-chair and I live in Vallejo.

MR. RASMUSSEN: My name is Chris Rasmussen, I'm a resident of Mare Island.

MR. GEMAR: Dwight Gemar with Weston.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Paula Tygielski from Benicia.

MR. COFFEY: Mike Coffey, RAB member from American Canyon.

MR. FARLEY: Steve Farley with CH2M Hill.

MR. QUIGLEY: Wendell Quigley, RAB member, Mare Island.

MR. JORGENSEN: Paisha Jorgensen, Water Board.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Gil Hollingsworth representing the City of Vallejo.

MS. NAITO: Hi, I'm Janet Naito with the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. I'm replacing Chip.

MR. AROMI: Ed Aromi with CH2M Hill.

MR. SILER: Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island.

MR. STEPHENS: Bill Stephens, Historic Ships Memorial at Pacific Square, USS Iowa project.

MR. POLLOCK: James Pollock, Historic Ships Memorial, Pacific Square.

MR. RICH: Lester Rich, Historic Ships Memorial at Pacific Square, Battleship Iowa project.

MR. PERRY: Richard Perry, DTSC.

MR. MC MURTRY: Dave Mc Murtry from Benicia.

MR. KAISER: John Kaiser, DOD program manager, Water Board.

MS. CHICHAKLI: Randa Chichakli, CDM, contractor for the Navy.

MS. DREYER: Marie Dreyer with the Navy.

MS. WOCHNICK: Heather Wochnick, BRAC Lead RPM, I'm going to be replacing Liz Barr.

MS. LEAR: Janet Lear, Navy.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thanks, everybody. As Heather said -- Heather, stand up. I just also wanted to introduce Heather Wochnick, she is the new Lead RPM for Mare Island so she'll work hand in hand with us and our team. She replaces Liz -- most of you hopefully remember Liz Barr who went onto Italy with the Navy for -- about a month and a half ago, two months ago.

So, welcome Heather. Heather was working on Alameda as a project manager. So with that, we'll get started on our first presentation. It's going to be given by Janet Lear with the Navy and Dwight Gemar with Weston Solutions. And it is an overview of the Draft Engineering

Evaluation and Cost Analysis or EE/CA for the munitions in the Production Manufacturing Area, or the PMA, and the South Shore Area, SSA.

II. NAVY PRESENTATION: *Overview of Draft Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for the Production Manufacturing Area (PMA) and South Shore Area (SSA)*

Presentation by Ms. Janet Lear, Navy and Mr. Dwight Gemar, Weston

MS. LEAR: Good evening, everyone. My name is Janet Lear. And as I said, I'm a Navy RPM. I'm presenting tonight on the Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis, affectionately known as the EE/CA for the munitions removal action at the Production Manufacturing Area and South Shore Area. The Production Manufacturing Area, PMA, and the South Shore Area, SSA, are both located in the southern part of Mare Island.

The PMA is a former munitions production facility that operated from 1857 to 1972. And the SSA was a former munitions storage and handling area in support of the PMA from the 1930s to 1972. The Production Manufacturing Area or the PMA processes conducted there included projectile rocket warhead assembly and breakdown, propellant loading, munitions refurbishment, storage, as well as munitions handling from piers. This photograph here shows loading munitions onto a ship at, I believe that's Pier 34. And the photograph is circa 1953. This photograph is of the South Shore Area, 1941. The South Shore Area was created from upland fill in the 1930s to the forties. It was used as a munitions storage area. There was some munitions handling, shipboard loading at Pier 35, as well as incorporation of inert components to underwater mines, as well as maintenance of munitions shipping containers. There have been several emergency removal actions conducted at the PMA/ SSA. The MEC was identified during some maintenance operations in the area and these emergency removal actions were conducted to address those identified items.

In '94 there was a preliminary assessment conducted, and in the mid-nineties an Unexploded Ordnance or UXO Site investigation was conducted. The site investigation included a magnetometer survey, and that survey identified over 2,000 metallic anomalies. After that site investigation was conducted, there was an intrusive investigation which investigated each of these anomalies. That was done in the late nineties. During this intrusive investigation a little over 2,000 munitions and explosives of concern, or MEC items, were recovered from 21 discrete locations. 75 percent of those MEC items were recovered in one shoreline area near dike fourteen. Dike fourteen is located within the South Shore Area. All the recovered MEC items were unfired and classified as discarded military munitions. In addition to the MEC items, over 1,000 tons of metallic debris were recovered.

These photos show the Production Manufacturing Area. The left-hand side, the left photo, shows where the items were recovered at the PMA during the intrusive investigation which I just spoke of. And the one on the right shows the locations where items were recovered during the emergency response actions. MEC items at the PMA were primarily recovered in clusters near the historic shoreline areas and the handling piers. This slide presents the same information for the South Shore Area. The left photo shows where items were recovered during the intrusive investigation. And the right photo shows where items were recovered during emergency response. Recovered items from the PMA were predominantly larger projectiles, six to 16 inch, dating from the 1890s to the 1930s. South Shore Area items were more diverse and smaller

types than the PMA. Projectiles, fuzes, primers, grenades dating from the Civil War through World War II.

Based on the items recovered, there were predominantly two modes of deposition; one being intentional disposal, primarily along the historic shoreline areas, as well as incidental handling loss near the loading piers and storage areas. The potential for human exposure is dependent on site access, intrusive activity to expose the subsurface MEC, and then disturbance of the exposed MEC. At this point I'm going to turn it over to Dwight so he can share some photos of items that were recovered at the PMA/ SSA.

MR. GEMAR: Okay. Thanks. And I just have a few photos and then I'll turn it back over to Janet. One of the most prolific type of munition items that we run across on Mare Island is the 20 millimeter anti-aircraft round. It's got a very small explosive charge, about a quarter of an ounce, but I suppose if you're on the receiving end it still is enough. And you can see in the photo -- well, this is actually the Oerlikon gun that was used to fire the items. And you can see that over time the items that we've located can come in all sorts of degraded looking shapes, some full up rounds and some just with the projectiles. And then on the right hand side is what it looks like when it's manufactured. And we also, primarily in the south shore, have run across these other components consisting of primers, which are used to initiate the propellant charge; the nose fuses to give a kick start to the detonation of the explosives; and also base fuses. And because Mare Island has been around so long, we've also run across 100 pound Parrott projectiles. You can see on the left a Civil War era photo of the type of gun used to fire these items. And I think right there is a bottle of whiskey or something like that it looks like. Just in case -- probably for medicinal purposes. And then on the right-hand side is --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Operational purposes.

MR. SILER: That always mixes well with explosives.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We wouldn't know, but maybe you do, Neal.

MR. GEMAR: Sounds like Neal has some experience with it. And then on the right is one of our UXO techs. And then, of course, the biggie that was used or loaded on the ships was the 16 inch battleship projectiles that the Iowa folks would recognize. On the left-hand side was actually a photo from a time capsule that was unearthed when one of the buildings was actually demo'd in the Production Manufacturing Area. They didn't know it was there. And one of the photos was a 1930s photo of -- these are the powder bags, and they would actually load five powder bags behind the 2,000 pound projectile, and once that puppy left the turret it traveled about 20 plus miles, and probably made an impression when it got to where it was going. And then on the right-hand side we actually recovered -- and this was actually back in 2005 -- 16 inch rounds. The Navy did some investigation with some non-intrusive instruments and determined that they were most likely inert or didn't have the explosive filler in the items. We didn't know that for sure, but that was the presumption. And back in 2005, I think it was, some Weston UXO techs actually took these out to the range in the southern part of Mare Island and used explosives to open up these -- and they were, in fact, inert. Fortunately, otherwise they would have made a very big bang. So that's a type of munitions that may still potentially be present in the PMA and the South Shore Area. I'll give it back to Janet.

MS. LEAR: Actually I didn't know about that time capsule, that's really interesting.

MR. GEMAR: Kind of cool.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Had lots of other things in it too.

MS. LEAR: I'll have to pick your brains on that. Okay. So now we want to discuss the current status of the site and the path forward.

In 2006 a second geophysical survey was done. Since the previous one was done in the mid-nineties, there was a lot of development in the technologies and advances in the instrumentation, so it was determined that another survey be conducted to get a better handle on the anomalies out there at the PMA/ SSA. The 2006 survey utilized the best available technology coupled with high accuracy navigation. The survey was conducted over all the accessible areas, and also included crawl space of three buildings. The survey identified more than 32,000 metallic anomalies. These photos here show -- these guys are in the crawl space of a building, it's a cart, I think it's Geofizer technology, and it's basically a magnetometer on a cart that they use in the crawl space of the buildings. The photo on your right-hand side is a magnetometer survey being conducted in the shoreline areas.

As part of the conceptual site model, the areas at the site were classified as either Category A or Category B sectors. The classification was based on history of MEC contamination; in other words: were MEC items recovered in these areas during the prior emergency response and removal actions? It was also based on past use; i.e., potential loss, disposal sites, piers, shorelines, outdoor storage. The Category A sectors are areas considered most likely to contain additional MEC. Category B sectors are areas where likelihood of MEC is considered low. This figure shows the Category A sectors in the PMA in the reddish color, and the Category B in green. You'll also see on this figure that the dots indicating where MEC items were recovered during previous investigations.

And you'll notice that there are some yellow dots that are out in the strait, and those are anomalies that would be investigated as part of Investigation Area K and would not be included in this removal action. This figure shows the same information for the South Shore Area with the Category A sectors in red and the Category B sectors in green.

This slide depicts the CERCLA process beginning with the preliminary assessment, site investigation and continuing down through the remedial design, remedial action. We're in the removal action box up here. And after we would complete this removal action, then we would move into the Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study to determine any further actions that might need to be conducted at the site. The Removal Action Objective determined for the PMA/ SSA is to reduce the threat to human health, welfare, and the environment from potential buried MEC, and to support and be consistent with future land uses. The South Shore Area is planned for open space and wildlife areas, and the PMA is planned for light industrial as well as some open space. The EE/CA evaluated four alternatives, the first being Alternative 1, the No Action Alternative which is required as a baseline to compare the other Alternatives. Alternative 2A includes excavation at all the Category A sector anomalies.

That would be about 15,000 anomalies and it would also include survey and excavation of -- in the crawl spaces of twelve additional buildings. Alternative 2B is 100 percent excavation at the Category A sector anomalies with 20 percent of Category B. That amounts to about 20,000 anomalies in addition to the 12 building crawl spaces. Alternative 2C is excavation of all the anomalies, which is 35,000 anomalies plus the 12 buildings.

The Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis went through the evaluation process with the alternatives. Alternative 1 was determined not to satisfy the Removal Action Objective of reducing risk, that's the No Action Alternative. 2A was considered the least effective because it did not investigate any of the Category B anomaly areas. And it was the least costly of the three remaining or the three active alternatives.

As a point of comparison, Alternative 2A is estimated to cost about \$5.7 million. Alternative 2B has a high degree of effectiveness at a mid-range cost. That's 100 percent of the sector A and 20 percent of sector B anomalies. Alternative 2C would be considered the most effective as it evaluates and investigates all the anomalies, all 35,000 plus anomalies. It's the highest cost with marginal incremental benefit. Alternative 2C is estimated to cost \$12 million. All of these alternatives would likely require some form of institutional controls, and any further action such as institutional controls would be evaluated in the feasibility study.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: What is the cost of 2B?

MS. LEAR: \$7.6 million. The preferred alternative is 2B which is the excavation of all Category A anomalies and 20 percent of Category B sector anomalies. This alternative includes complete geophysical surveys under the twelve additional buildings that have crawl spaces but have not been surveyed. It investigates 100 percent of Category A and all the building crawl space anomalies, and it also investigates 20 percent of the Category B sector anomalies. Those 20 percent would be selected based on characteristics of the anomalies with emphasis on areas of high anomaly density.

And in addition, if MEC items are encountered at the Category B sector, the excavation would be stepped out in 25 foot increments to investigate adjacent anomalies. This slide depicts the anomaly investigation process which begins with developing a target list of anomalies. As mentioned, that would be 100 percent of Category A and all the building anomalies, and then selected 20 percent of Category B. The crews would re-acquire and excavate at all the anomalies on that target list. If items are found at either Category A or B then, of course, the excavation would be expanded laterally to recover those items. In addition, at the Category B anomalies there would be step-outs. If items were recovered at an anomaly, there would be a step-out in 25 foot increments to evaluate any adjacent anomalies. The initial excavation would be a two foot radius -- a minimum of a two foot radius around the selected anomaly. The Draft EE/CA was sent out this month, and we're expecting agency comments in July.

Right now we scheduled a Draft Final for August 2009, with a 30 day public review and comment period, and the public meeting in fall of '09, followed by the responsiveness summary in December. The Action Memorandum and the Final Work Plan for the Removal Action are scheduled for spring 2010 with the removal action field work in that summer of 2010. So I'm going to open up for questions if there are any? Yes, Paula.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I'm just curious, the 20 percent of the B, how do you pick which 20 percent are getting investigated?

MS. LEAR: The selection process would be based on the anomaly characteristics. There is a prove-out plot, they call it, with the geophysical survey where they bury items of different sizes, and then the instruments are run over those -- are surveyed over those, and you get anomaly intensities and shapes that are indicative of that size and that depth. So you would use that as part of your selection process. So you would pick the anomalies that were likely to be

representative of those kind of items, those sizes. And, in addition, there would be a selection process for areas where there are a lot of anomalies, like maybe in clusters, that would be higher on your selection process as well. Dwight, did you have anything further to add to that?

MR. GEMAR: Well, I think that's -- it's pretty close. Because we have found these items in groups, as Janet said, the geophysicist will look for anything that looks like a burial pit where there's just a lot of density in terms of the locale. And we'll definitely look at all of those as part of that 20 percent. And we've actually done a very similar -- well, actually an identical approach at the Western Magazine [Area] in IR-05, and that seemed to work pretty well because it really did find some honey holes, as we call them, where we were able to find some pits that had items deposited there, or in some cases trenches. But we'll also do kind of a spatially diverse selection as well. So we'll look at all of the potential pits, but then we'll also select random items just to get good coverage and make sure that we don't miss something, a onesy-twosey kind of thing.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: When you say -- Paula, go ahead.

MS. TYGIELSKI: My second question is about the maps. There are these areas that are Category A and are red in color, but there's no dots anywhere near them. So that indicates that nothing's been found in the past. Why are those Category A sectors?

MS. LEAR: Is this the figure you're looking at?

MS. TYGIELSKI: Yeah, and the one before it.

MS. LEAR: Well, it was based on the use of the area. So if the buildings were used for munitions loading, manufacturing, that would classify as a Category A sector. As well as, you know, in addition, as you're mentioning, the dots indicating that there were things found. I'm trying to see. There's a long area here where there's none of the blue dots, but those were all buildings that were used in the process. So, in other words, it's a two-fold classification system, what was done there and what was found there. Does that answer your question?

MS. TYGIELSKI: (Nodded head.)

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I just wanted to follow up on your 20 percent in Category B. When you say 20 percent of the sector anomalies, 20 percent by grid? I mean within all of the grids, or 20 percent of what?

MS. LEAR: 20 percent of the total number of anomalies.

MR. GEMAR: But we also would target 20 percent minimum in each grid, so we would make sure that we got coverage of the whole area.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Good. That's what I wanted answered. Because 20 percent of the anomalies could be just let's go just dig in one hole, oh, we found our 20 percent of 10,000 or whatever it is. So, yeah, per grid.

MR. GEMAR: Right.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah. Good clarification there.

MS. LEAR: Any other questions?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, actually I have some other questions. I was just following up on Paula's question there. But I'm waiting to see if anybody else has any before I ask them. On Category A and B you note that -- well, I guess A, you note that the offshore anomalies are

covered by IA-K and aren't a part of this project. Can you identify for us what your boundary is on -- in Investigation Area K within these illustrations?

MS. LEAR: Well, for instance, a good portion of these yellow dots would be considered IA-K. That's not a very good figure because you can't really distinguish between the individual dots, but all of the green and the red areas would be part of this removal action. But as you note, there's some squares there that are not solid colored.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'm just trying to figure out, if all the yellows are considered part of the offshore or all the yellow dots or if those -- I don't -- I can't figure out your figure here.

MS. LEAR: Yeah, that is confusing. Dwight, do you --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: You've got blue dots, yellow dots, and then you say that IA-K dots are not included.

MS. LEAR: Yeah, you're right. You're right.

MR. GEMAR: I think the one thing that's a little confusing, you're right, Myrna, is that the yellow dots are from the 2006 offshore investigation. And what they did is they did transects perpendicular to the shoreline, and so some of those transects actually come onto part of the area that we would investigate. So pretty much what we're going to do is investigate all of the walkable tidal areas, both at the PMA, and it's really only this area up here primarily. Over here this is a seawall here, and so anything outboard of the seawall would be covered by the IA-K. And then at the south shore, which I think is the next one, we'll do again part of the walkable part of the shoreline here, and then anything outboard of that would be the follow-on work.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I think this is just an example of how these little figures aren't really very instructive and we can't go home and use them very effectively unless we have massive magnification, because I can't see that legend, and I don't know anybody else in this room who's probably got the eyesight to see that.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Yeah, even with these high powered reading glasses.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So in the future for your presentations if you just want to do a slide per page, that probably would be more useful for us to take home.

MR. COFFEY: Or one of these.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah, or one of those, precisely. Thank you. So if that could be noted by the Navy and its team as well as the other responsible parties in the room. I have a question. When you refer to anomalies, can you -- you don't describe anywhere in here what you're talking about: anomalies, anomaly characteristics, high anomaly densities. And that might be useful for some people who might not know what an anomaly is. And are you looking at MEC anomalies or -- I mean, you can't determine that necessarily with your -- your data, so tell us about that.

MS. LEAR: The instruments that are used to detect metallic objects, so I think in a couple of slides we talk about metallic anomalies. And what happens is your instrument as you go over some kind of metallic object, whether it's scrap metal or a MEC item, you get a response in your instrument from that metallic object. So it tells you something's there, but it doesn't tell you what it is, and you can't know what it is until you do your excavation. And that's why in one of the earlier slides you notice that we, during the previous intrusive investigations, there was a lot of scrap metal that was recovered, because a lot of those anomalies will turn out to be just that.

MR. COFFEY: Junk.

MS. LEAR: Anomaly density just means that you have a lot of these high readings in a close area which could be indicative of a place where they, you know, dumped scrap metal or it could be indicative of a place where MEC items were disposed. Does that answer the question?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, it certainly does. I mean I already knew the answer, but I just thought that that was sort of a hole here.

MS. LEAR: Okay, I appreciate that.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: So I hope it is useful to other folks.

MR. COFFEY: For the remaining areas, of all the anomalies that are not going to be removed --

MS. LEAR: Uh-huh.

MR. COFFEY: -- are you guys going to do a site categorization to say what is likely left behind? I mean, you know, we had thousands of tons of garbage that was basically pulled out of the ground. We saw a lot of that on some of our tours. So if you're going to leave a lot of this stuff sitting around and some of these are going to be open spaces, light industrial, all these types of things, are we going to know what it is likely that is going to be left behind, so that if these places are being used, somewhere along the line someone is going to be able to be notified and say that there is a likelihood of this, that, or the other thing left in this ground or in this area if you're going to be using it?

MS. LEAR: A couple of answers to that. The first thing I would say is after we do this investigation we will have more information to put into our conceptual site model for the sector B areas. So we'd have a better idea of what might be out there. The second part of the answer is no matter what we do we're not going to be able to say for 100 percent that there's nothing there, MEC items. Because the instruments -- the efficiency of the instruments is based on size of the object and depth. So, for instance, a smaller item deeper in the ground we wouldn't be able to see. So regardless of what we do, there will be able to be some kind of controls, regardless of whether it's land use controls, signs. And all that would be evaluated further in the Feasibility Study.

MR. RASMUSSEN: I'm just curious as to why the two piers in the diagram of the SSA seem to fall outside either of these two sectors. Is that because historically nothing was ever found around those two piers that we know, 34 and 35?

MR. COFFEY: They're not there anymore.

MR. GEMAR: They're still there, but that would be part of IA-K, the Offshore Investigation.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: In your engineering -- in your analysis, is that for just the removal action, not the land use controls cost?

MS. LEAR: Correct, this is just for the removal action.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Because I'll just go on the record again, every few years I do, as reminding the Navy about the land use controls, because we are involved in the development of a portion of that property as open space / park land and that one of the logical ways to -- and a way that we have had agreement in the past at very high levels of the Navy, that one of the solutions is ongoing public information and education, that has been demonstrated countless times as the

most effective way to prevent exposure and reduce risk is public education. And that the Navy had committed many times in the past -- and I don't want you to forget -- to an instructive facility, materials, website, a broad range of tools. So that when you're removing these items, I'll remind you again, that it's to your advantage, so you don't have to go back and try to reconstruct some of them, to save them and have your contract specify that they be saved for a future display or Web-based information.

We're finding that a lot of this material was sent off to the scrappers in the past, and is not going to help the public engage on this topic in a vital way, which is going to be the key to any of us, you know, signing off, whether it's the regulating agencies or passing the straight face test with the public on this being open, whether it's for light industrial or recreational or open space use. If you can't show me -- and I know this because we've been doing this now for a year down at the south end of the island, that people aren't interested in walking around, passively just walking around hearing about munitions. They want to see for themselves the munitions that were actually found at that site.

And they will make a beeline for a visitor center if they can -- where they can see an actual -- the actual items. So if I hear again that that stuff's just being dumped into scrap and not being saved for the future, you know, we'll have to escalate this. Because that's been the agreement formal or informal for the last 15 years and I wouldn't want the Navy to take a different route at this point.

MS. LEAR: Good comment. Thank you.

MR. COFFEY: One of the overriding concerns that I've had whenever I hear about things being left behind, and you know when we were talking about capping being done in other places, is the fact that now that Mare Island is becoming a neighborhood, and that I know, as somebody who used to be a kid, if I knew that this kind of stuff was sitting around, I'd go looking for it. That's my concern is, you know, we're going to have these neighborhoods, we're going to have a lot of children running around, this is going to be their natural playground. And the more stuff left behind -- and this is the reason I was asking about categorization -- is that, you know, granted we run a risk of putting up signs and saying that there are things here, and intentionally directing children to go and look for this type of stuff. But the more and more of this stuff left behind, the more and more curious people are going to be looking for this. And I mean when we're talking about cost effectiveness and, you know, group A and group B and whether, you know, it's best to get everything out or only the most cost effective, I wonder where that cost effectiveness comes into play, you know. If at some point in time somebody loses an arm or a hand because something gets left behind, where does the cost effectiveness lay after that?

MS. LEAR: And that's a very good point. And the one thing I wanted to reiterate is the only way that we would be able to say that nothing was left behind would be to dig everything out, even where there's no anomalies, just go out there and dig everything down to four feet or deeper or however far you think those kids would dig. I mean, that's the only way we can say that there's nothing left behind.

MR. COFFEY: But we are still taking a risk.

MS. LEAR: Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, I just -- it doesn't have to be kids. Apparently there was clearly an adult out using a metal detector in an area that's been known to have munitions. And again, if you designate these areas as parks, national parks, state parks, do not allow metal detecting in

any of their facilities, and those kinds of policies could be put in place, and you would expect that there would be some monitoring. And there again, that's a cost the Navy should be putting into their budgets and expecting to participate in perpetuity. You are the responsible party. So whether you set up an endowment account or whatever mechanism you want to use, that's what we will be expecting from the regulators and from the Navy. And I think that's the least that the public can expect in terms of risk. And again, public education has been proven -- and I don't have to tell DTSC or anybody else in this room who knows about munitions incidents.

Tierrasanta had everything to do with the dropping off of public education. That was the only reason why two children, one or two children were killed there and other children were injured. And that was what was proven was because the original developer agreed to an aggressive education program, and those homes were sold, the developer went away, DTSC didn't regulate properly, didn't monitor what kind of public education was going on, and kaboom. And that's all it took. So that's the big black mark in California. And the Navy can either aggressively work to prevent that kind of incident -- and there are ways to prevent it -- or you can be going around trying to dig up 100 percent, which I think is not a good use of the limited dollars that we do have. But to try to say, oh, the property's off limits, we're doing that right now, trying to say it's off limits, and it's not off limits to anybody who wants to go play in your playground. Flat out, it isn't. It doesn't matter whether one of your really dear wonderful people who is supposed to be policing has recently passed away or not, the fact is people go down there all the time on that property. So I'm anxious to see you move ahead. I don't want -- I want you to full speed ahead continue on this project that's one of your top priorities, but know that you're going to have a responsibility in perpetuity on this property, a very visible opportunity in perpetuity as well.

MS. LEAR: And you're absolutely right. And I think the Navy has learned from lessons from things that have happened. I know that at Adak Island there's a very extensive education program for the visitors there. And I think that, you know, some of those factors would come into play here as well. And after the removal action then we, you know, partake of the RI/ FS. And during that process a lot of these other issues would be evaluated and the cost estimated, and we'll have another forum like this.

MS. TYGIELSKI: I think that's one reason that would be good to have the theoretical bomb museum, because that's a place people can go and look at stuff and go, ooh, that's cool, and not have to spend their own time digging it up.

MS. LEAR: Good point. Anything else?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Janet and Dwight. Next we'll begin on our second presentation to be given by Neal Siler with Lennar Mare Island. It is on additional investigations at fuel oil pipeline segments, various numbers, which I'll let him explain, but they're all in Investigation Area C-2.

III. PRESENTATION: *Fuel Oil Pipeline (FOPL) Segments E2/VAR/B688B: Additional Investigations in Investigation Area (IA) C-2*
Presentation by Mr. Neal Siler, Lennar Mare Island (LMI)

MR. SILER: Okay. Now the first thing I'd like to do is say that it's a little known fact that that time capsule that was down there that you saw that had the 16 inch shell and the cordite bags, I was actually one of the items that was in that time capsule, and I was in there with that bottle of

whiskey that you saw from Fort Sumter, and I guarantee it was full when I went in, it was empty when I came out, and I'm living proof that MEC and whiskey do mix well.

(Thereupon occurred simultaneous discussion.)

MR. SILER: Okay. What I'm going to talk about, as Michael mentioned, is some additional investigations we're going to implement at Fuel Oil Pipeline segments E2/VAR/B688B in Investigation Area C-2. And just so everybody knows, for the nomenclature for the FOPL segments, the island actually has a grid system, there are columns that are letters, there are rows that are numbers. So when you see something like E2, that tells you it's in column E, row two. It gives you an idea where it is. The VAR means that it's a variable diameter, this segment. And then B688 says it's somewhere close to a building that is in the vicinity of where it's at.

What I'm going to try to do here, I was going to try to describe some or illustrate some issues that are common for a fuel oil pipeline site. I'm going to talk about working in an enclosed area or enclosed space in a heavily developed area that's been developed multiple times over the year. The types of things you have to look for and the types of material that you have to work with when you're doing those investigations. Often it's overlapping utilities, often it's using material from other investigations at other facilities that you're looking at to give you an idea of what you need to go to next. Talking about just some documentation that either is non-existent or you kind of have to go back and recreate to try to figure out what's going on. And then working with all that to go ahead and try to figure out what you're going to do next to be able to get a site to closure. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to describe the site. I'm going to talk about the geologic conditions. I'm going to talk about some of the previous investigations that we've performed in this area.

And I'm going to finally talk about the additional investigation that we're proposing to go forward that we hope will support the path forward to get to closure for this site. So this is the general location of the area. And you can see the study area is in black right down here. This is where we're looking. It's close to Building 688 right here, and Building 750 right here. It's about 1,100 feet west of Mare Island Strait which is off to the east here. You can't really see it, it doesn't show up real well here, but you can see a red line if you take a look at your handouts. This is the original 1859 shoreline when Mare Island really was an island. So you can see how this is accreted to the west here, it's about 500 feet to the east of the former original shoreline. The geologic materials that you see in here are essentially unconsolidated natural deposits and dredge material. So you're really looking at fine silts, clays, sands, and the dredge materials that were deposited there as the island accreted out toward the east. And I'm going to kind of run over some of those slides that have some of the descriptions on.

You can read along if you'd like, but I'm going to use the photos here to illustrate some of those things. This FOPL segment is this one right here. It's about 350 feet long. Although it has a designation of VAR on it appears to be about two inches in diameter, there may be some areas where there's step-ups or step-downs around the joints where it may go from three to two or two and a half, something like that, but it appears to be about two inches in diameter. Now, I'm getting ahead of myself here.

Now, when we first discovered this FOPL segment, we were actually looking, and the Navy actually looked for these underground storage tanks here. And this is Underground Storage Tank or UST 688-1, 688-2, 688-3. And they were associated with -- actually the building that was here before Building 750 was here which was Building 740. It was constructed in the late

forties, and it was actually these tanks fed some service stations that were associated with this Building 740.

Now, this building was demolished in about 1975, and the tanks were reportedly removed about then. Now, we don't have very good documentation as to the removal of those tanks because during that time period there wasn't a lot of people who were really paying attention to these types of things keeping, looking at that documentation. So as we started looking at these, and the Navy did the first investigation in this area here, they started looking at how they could distinguish these tanks because although they had this anecdotal information that they had been removed, there really wasn't any concrete documentation that they had been removed in 1978. So -- so I really got ahead of myself there.

So the first investigation was in 1991 and there was another investigation in 2002, excuse me. And it really dealt with the geophysical technique, ground penetrating radar. Now, the first investigation was done in this area right here, and because of the poor documentation this probably wasn't the right area. As we went back and took a look we found better documentation that showed that it was in this area right here. This is about 90 feet to the east of where the tanks were actually documented as being originally located. And although the Navy did find some anomalies in this area that could be interpreted as potential underground tanks, they actually went back and did some additional investigations, they put in three borings, took samples, but they couldn't find any indication that any tank or any piping was located in this area.

So when we came back on board in 2002, we looked through the documentation and went for the ground penetrating radar in this area. And one of the questions that Myrna had asked in the previous presentation was about anomalies. When you're using the ground penetrating radar, you're really looking for disturbed area. You'll see something that looks totally different, and that gives you an indication that maybe it was excavated and they put something back in to give you an idea, maybe it was disturbed and maybe something was put in there or taken out of those areas. The other thing you can see with the GPR, depending what type you have, you can see metal if you look at the GPR in that area. So we went back in 2002 and looked in this area here. And although we couldn't identify any anomalies associated with an underground storage tank, looked like that, we did find some anomalies that looked like there was some unidentified piping and utility conduits that weren't associated with the USTs, and that's how we found this FOPL segment as you look at it here.

So moving forward, in addition to the ground penetrating radar survey that we did, we actually put in two soil borings that were advanced near the suspected locations of Underground Storage Tanks 688-1, -2, and -3. We collected soil samples at four, seven, and ten feet below ground surface. We also selected reconnaissance groundwater samples from those borings. We analyzed those samples for petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline, because we knew that UST 688-1 and -2 were reportedly gasoline tanks. We also looked at diesel and motor oil. The diesel was associated with Underground Storage Tank 688-3, and then we had the motor oil that would be associated with the former fuel oil pipeline.

We also looked for aromatic hydrocarbons, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, and that ubiquitous compound that we all came to know in the eighties and nineties, methyl tertiary butyl ether. Now, we didn't find anything that was above a Tier I Environmental Screening Level or really detected except for the petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel and motor oil. We actually looked at some polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons, couldn't find any detections of those

above the reporting limits, so we focused in on the petroleum hydrocarbons at that time. Now, what we're going to propose to do is go back and take a look at the area -- and I'm going to go to the next slide which kind of illustrates where we're looking here. We're going to propose to put in one trench. And this trench is kind of out of place here because where we really want to put this trench is right in this bend right here, this supposed bend that we have in the pipeline right here, because if we're going to see leaks, we're probably going to see them around the joints of the pipelines. We want to take a look right there.

And also, with a sampling and analysis plan that we have, we're going to put two soil borings in at 100 foot intervals which has been approved by the regulatory agencies down this fuel oil pipeline segment, and this one right down here, this one right here will hopefully be right near the joint or the bend in that pipeline. We're going to take soil samples and groundwater samples. We're going to analyze those for petroleum hydrocarbons and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon compounds. And that's what we're proposing to do. So, in summary, you know, most of the work to date near the fuel oil pipeline has been actually associated with Underground Storage Tank 688-1, -2, and -3. Those tanks have been closed by the regulatory agencies as far as the petroleum hydrocarbon compounds associated with them. We're going to focus the new investigation along the fuel oil pipeline segment, and we hope that the data that we collect will aid us in supporting a path forward, hopefully leading to closure. So with that, that's the end of my presentation this evening. Does anybody have any questions? Well, that's a -- oops, Chris.

MR. RASMUSSEN: What do you think is going to be the impact on traffic?

MR. SILER: Probably in this area you're not going to have much traffic because down here, this is actually heavily industrialized area where Jefco and XKT have their operations, so you're probably not going to see much of an impact on the residents or the other businesses on the island, because it's kind of like Railroad Avenue, it just kind of curves around down there, and that's actually part of their facility as you move down in this area.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Is there going to be a need to close the road at all?

MR. SILER: Not right now. I think we should be actually able to work on the east side of the road at this time, so I don't think it's going to be an issue.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: That's more of a destination area. It's not a thoroughfare where somebody drives through there. They're either going to Jefco or AB -- Jefco, ABC, or over to --

MR. SILER: XKT.

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- XKT on business, because it's just not a route people take.

MR. SILER: Okay. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thank you, Neal. With that, we'll lead into our first public comment period. Is there any public comment?

(No response.)

Okay. We'll go ahead and take our ten minute break.

(Thereupon there was a brief recess.)

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS (Myrna Hayes and Michael Bloom)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay, everyone, we'll go ahead and get started. First up is administrative business and announcements. As far as administrative business, I would say if anybody has any comments on the minutes from last meeting, please get them to myself or Myrna. And as far as announcements I'll turn it over to Myrna.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: We have dueling microphones here. I have a sympathy card for Bob Palmer's wife, Connie, that could come from us, from the RAB, and if you haven't signed a card already to her, I'm sure you're aware that Bob lost his battle with lung cancer a couple of weeks ago. It's sort of a freak thing as far as I know, just a surgery procedure that didn't go right, whatever. I don't know, maybe other people do, but here's a card. And we'll terribly miss him. A great contribution to this community.

You probably had no idea all the things that he did to keep the Navy properties looked out after and to -- I'm sure he was a good friend to many people, but to the park, to the south end of Mare Island he was very, very dedicated. And just at a moment's notice would -- you just had to pick up the phone and say what you needed, and a generator would appear for the day because ours wouldn't start, or a ladder would appear, or a phone call would be made and would make a parking lot available from the Army Reserves when they weren't returning my phone calls, or a building would appear via a forklift, or a picnic table, whatever it was. And Bob was just a hell of a great guy, the kind of person you want to have as a partner in something as complex as converting an old abandoned military base to something alive. So please sign that card if you'd like to.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you, Myrna. Yes, Bob is truly missed. I got to know him in the last couple years being up here, and he was one great individual. And Building 535 was very lonely today up there without him in there.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: I'll just tell one other quick story. I had the grand -- the great grand-nephew of the lighthouse keeper at the property. Bob took us along the shoreline about a year ago with that gentleman's daughter. And we ground truthed the lighthouse site, we went to their gravesite, and then we went to the -- he dropped us off and we went on up to the top of the hill to look down on the site. And they were asking him -- it was with the team from the State Coastal Conservancy, and they were actually writing an article for their publication "Coast and Ocean" and they had the reporter and different folks there. And someone asked him, you know, if there were any maps, or asked me if there were any maps which showed where the lighthouse really was, and I said, well, I didn't have any. And Bob said goodbye. And about 20 minutes later he called and he said, "Where are you?" And I said, "Well, we're at the top of the hill." And he said, "Well, I have some maps for you." And I said, "Well, where are you?" And he said, "I'm just around the corner." And he had gone back, he'd gone to the map room, and he had found two, like, I don't know what they are, velum, you know, those linen with that kind of plasticky cover, and he unrolled those on the hood of the car, and it was the most exciting moment for these family members. Remember, the lighthouse keeper, Kate MacDougal, actually died in 1930, and so these were maps way before that. And so the daughter said, "Well, why didn't we know about these before?" Bob said, "No one asked." And so --

MR. FARLEY: Sounds like Bob.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: -- in future e-mails he was referred to as "Bob-no-one-asked Palmer."

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thanks, Myrna. I also have an announcement. We are going to have our RAB focus group meeting to discuss the Community Relations Plan/ Community Involvement Plan. We've scheduled that for Tuesday, June 9th. Most of you should have been on the e-mails. And the best day that almost everybody could get together was June 9th, Tuesday. So we're going to have that meeting here in this building starting at 6:30 on Tuesday, June 9th. So everyone is welcome, and we'll be throwing around ideas, start talking about that Community Relations Plan. So that's my announcement. And with that we'll go into the focus group reports. Wendell, community?

V. FOCUS GROUP REPORTS

a) Community (Wendell Quigley)

MR. QUIGLEY: Nothing at this time.

b) Natural Resources (Jerry Karr)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Natural resources, Jerry? How is he, do we know? He e-mailed the first go-round but not the second go-round to me. So hopefully he does show up. Technical, Paula.

c) Technical (Paula Tygielski)

MS. TYGIELSKI: No report.

d) City Report (Gil Hollingsworth)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Thank you. Gil, with the City?

MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: The City has nothing to report.

e) Lennar Update (Steve Farley)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Steve with Lennar. I know you have something to report.

MR. FARLEY: Indeed. I've got a handout, our normal 11 by 17 handout over here. I think what I'd like to do tonight is to emphasize a couple of things, some of the major documents that are coming up, public comment periods, public meetings, etcetera. I'll get to that in a second. Just to touch base on the photos. In the last few months we've presented the status of the UST 231 and 243 investigations and excavations. These tanks were located over by the Building 637 area down along Azuar Drive. Those buildings are now gone and the excavation has been completed and we've backfilled it.

The photos on the left-hand side, the one on the bottom shows one of the storm sewer pipelines that we put in after the excavations were completed. We ripped out some pipelines, had to replace them. The photo on the top is -- just gives you a good idea of sort of the expanse of the area that was excavated and now backfilled. It's almost to grade. It's not quite easy to see in this photograph, but we're almost back to grade. We could be back to grade by now, this photograph is just a short while ago. In the background you can see some piles of dirt, those actually are -- not the covered ones but the uncovered ones -- and that's some additional backfill material that was planned for being placed at this time.

And if you look real closely you can see a lot of marks on the ground, that's from the sheep's foot roller that's compacting the soil. We've got to make sure that we have the soil compacted properly before we finish up on the site. On the right-hand side this is an excavation that we did at Pump Station Number 6, sort of down by the Building 386, 388, and 390 area, sort of an area

that Neal was talking about before. And the only reason I included this photo is to give you an idea of some of the more typical excavations that we do. This is not a large excavation, but it's certainly not a small one. But the other thing is if you look on the far left-hand side of the photograph, sort of where the shadow is for the excavator bucket, you can see a fairly sharp break in the color of the soils. And what that typically represents is -- the lighter brown colored material on the top is typically a fill material, and the material underneath which is darker and has a lot more clay in it is typically either dredge materials or some of the finer grain sediments that were a part of the shoreline at one time.

So let's go down to the lower left corner where we have the status of the various documents. I think the thing that I want to really emphasize tonight is there's a lot of major documents that have been or will be submitted for finalization and/or agency review. If you look at the significant upcoming documents there's three or four major documents there. The first one, the FS/RAW for IR-21, that document is actually going to be submitted for agency review sometime in the next -- probably within the next week or two. So those are all major important documents. Those documents will be submitted to the normal distribution list for all of our major documents, and will also go to the library. So if anybody has an interest in taking a look at those, there will be copies over in the library.

The lower left corner, the upcoming public comment periods, there's three major public comment periods coming up. The first one is for the FS/ RAP for the Black Granular Material in the Triangle Area. The Triangle Area is shown on the figure, it's a triangular shaped area with a purple line around it. That public comment period will occur primarily through the month of June. There's actually a public meeting that is slated for June 18th, 7:00 p.m. here. The other two documents there, the IA-B1 or Crane Test Area FS/ RAP, the public comment period will be in July as will for the FS/RAW for IR-21 document. So a couple of really important public comment periods and/or meetings, and we sure encourage everybody to come out and participate in those public meetings. There are a couple of other things that we're doing. If you'll look on the figure, there's been no change in the status of closure for any of these IA's. We're doing some work at some FOPL segments, separate from the one that Neal mentioned, and they're shown in the lower portion of the map, sort of the purple lines with D1/4/B290W, and then the other one is the E2/6/B386.

And as Neal mentioned, those numbers are -- they make sense once you figure out the code, the grids, and then the diameters, and then the buildings that are nearby. The other thing that we're working on is getting started with some soil excavation work at UST 693 which is in the northern portion of the site. We just completed a work plan and got approval to start that so we'll be starting that fairly soon. So that's all I have for tonight. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Neal, on a RAB agenda setting meeting conference call last week you mentioned that these two projects were coming up, the Crane Test Area RAP – FS/ RAP and the RAW for IR-21, so I'd like to just request that those be on the June agenda for the RAB meeting prior to your public meetings, but I assume those are within your public comment periods or shortly before.

MR. FARLEY: So just to be clear, do you want the public meetings as part of the RAB agenda or do you want a presentation in that?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Oh, a presentation. I don't think that we want to go -- cross that bridge again right now in terms of whether -- where and when the public meetings get held.

MR. FARLEY: So I just want to be clear. What you're asking for is a presentation?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. FARLEY: Of those two documents?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Right.

MR. FARLEY: In the June RAB meeting?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

MR. FARLEY: Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Since they're both coming up for comment periods during July, I would assume that it would be practical to have those on the agenda in June, unless either one of those slips to August, and then you can maybe break it up and do one in July and one in June.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. Thanks, Steve. Next we'll go to Dwight for the Weston update.

f) Weston Update (Dwight Gemar)

MR. GEMAR: Thanks, Michael. I'm sitting in for Cris today, he couldn't be here. If everyone had a chance to grab the Weston update sheet, in the upper left we have some documents that are under review which are listed there; the five year review for the Western Early Transfer Parcel, the Post Closure Plan for the IA-H1 Area, and then also a pair of documents that pertain to Site IR-05 and the Western Magazine Area, the Conceptual Site Model and the Munitions Response Completion Report are under review.

The next section is the SSTP Outfall, and that's the photograph and the insert. Just below it is the location of the Sanitary Sewage Treatment Plant Outfall. We've been meeting with the regulators over the last couple of months, and we have provided a technical memo, and the agencies provided comments on May 5th, so we're preparing responses. In general DTSC would like to see some more sampling out there since we did have some elevated hits of mercury at the edge of our previous sampling area, so we're evaluating that and plan to get back with the agencies further on that.

A quick update below that for IR-05 based on some e-mail traffic. It looks like we might be getting a biological opinion soon, hopefully in June, which will allow us to complete the excavation out at IR-05. So hopefully that will come to pass. And then the last thing I had on the update, and I see the Navy also included it in theirs, I try not to steal their thunder but --

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: That's okay.

MR. GEMAR: -- the reason I included it in here, the Navy actually funded this through a separate contract, but the reason I included it here is most of the 1,260 items that were detonated and destroyed over the last couple of weeks were recovered from the Western Magazine Area in IR-05. And you can see a couple of photos; one of the UXO technicians placing some of the recovered munitions items on this kind of tannish looking material which is actually the C4 explosive, it's kind of -- looks like a roll of cookie dough and it's called flex sheet.

And basically they put the items on it and then wrap it up like a burrito and put a det cord on it and blow it all to heck and back. And they also put several feet of sand on top before they fire the shot to deaden the sound. And you can see in the photo below some of that sand being ejected by the blast. And this little detonation pit is in the extreme corner or southwest corner of

one of the former dredge ponds, Dredge Pond 7, which itself is in the southwest corner of Mare Island. You can see the Carquinez Strait and San Pablo Bay in the background there. So it's pretty much out of the way or as far out of the way as you can get on Mare Island. And we try to keep each shot pretty small to minimize the sound. And I don't think anybody, probably other than folks on the golf course heard these shots. And we might be responsible for a few missed putts but, or at least that's probably the excuse that they made, but other than that I think it was pretty much a non-event for the folks.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Does this U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service biological opinion, is it going to also include -- or is this a separate activity with the paint waste? Weren't they supposed to be commenting on that as well?

MR. GEMAR: Yeah, it's actually a combined biological opinion so it will address both sites.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Okay. Good. Of course, not to belabor the point, but why not? All of these munitions that got blown up, did we already have examples of them for our bomb museum?

MR. GEMAR: These were all live items so they had to be destroyed. But the answer to your question is that I don't believe we had any new examples of inert items from the work that had been done previously other than, obviously, what's already in Building 535. So we did miss out on the opportunity during the removal action for the Western Magazine back in 2005 and 2006.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Was that because the Navy didn't make that part of the contract, or what was that about? Because we've been harping -- I've been harping on this for 15 years. So what part of this -- where is the breakdown in communication about this topic? Where is the lack of vision, commitment, I mean, you know, seriousness? Not to put you, Dwight, on the spot, Weston, but I'm just getting a little bit confused or frustrated or angry or, you know, I'm not going to use a food term or a drinking term here, but it's getting me mad.

MR. COFFEY: Irritated.

MR. GEMAR: Well, unfortunately at the time we did the work, yeah, it was not on my radar screen. Now I do believe that the remnants of the 16 inch rounds are still in one of the buildings -- I need to verify that -- but the smaller inert items would have been recycled as scrap.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well just, you know, Michael, who at your agency gets it together to get that into your contracts? And can you make a commitment? Can you speak to that tonight? Cause we have another major cleanup coming up in a few month's time. Is that going to be a commitment of the U.S. Navy at Mare Island Naval Shipyard?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: You're talking about what we just talked about, the PMA/ SSA area?

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: To harvest items that will --

MS. TYGIELSKI: Save stuff.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: As you have that small collection at Building 535, that's very small and very incomplete, but it does not in any way represent the variety of munitions found at Mare Island. How do we get on your radar screen about this topic?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Well, I can say that you have, I mean I'm hearing, so -- I'm hearing.

MR. COFFEY: Done. Done.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: So, yes, I will make a commitment that, yes, I will definitely bring it to the attention of everybody so that everybody is aware of it.

MR. COFFEY: So you are now the responsible party?

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I'm making that commitment that I will look into it.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: All contracts for future environmental -- cleanup of munitions at Mare Island will include -- I mean I can trust that this will occur? Because I'm not going to know about it until it's already a done deal.

MS. TYGIELSKI: Save the interesting stuff.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Yeah, I'm saying I will definitely look into it.

MR. COFFEY: Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Well, look into it isn't really very strong.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: I will bring --

MR. COFFEY: You couldn't hedge that one any better.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: What I'm saying is I will bring it up with everybody and make it an important issue on this base. Okay. Thanks, Dwight. Next is the regulatory update. Janet.

g) Regulatory Agency Update (Janet Naito, Paisha Jorgensen, Carolyn D'Almeida)

MS. NAITO: I have to apologize, I'm sorry, I didn't realize I would be an agenda item so I'm not prepared.

MR. COFFEY: Dog ate your homework?

MS. NAITO: Other than to say hi, I'm Janet, and I'm replacing Chip Gribble as DTSC's project manager. I replaced him as of May 15th, I believe. So I'm looking forward to this challenge.

MR. COFFEY: Wow, no Chip.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thank you, Janet.

MS. NAITO: Sorry.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Paisha.

MR. JORGENSEN: From the Water Board side, I've -- most of the Navy and Lennar and CH2M Hill knows I'm going to be taking a short vacation in June so they're quickly piling up documents on my desk for me to take with me. I've hired a U-Haul truck to bring the documents with me and I'll make sure I'll read 'em every night.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: And give us your address for the Fed Ex.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yeah, of course.

MR. FARLEY: At least we have him trained.

MR. JORGENSEN: Just to let Steve know, I submitted two FOPL No Further Actions yesterday or the day before to Lennar, so that should be included on this next time. I'm working on a few

others. But I'm looking forward to working with Janet. We've had a lot of conversations so far asking me questions, and I'm filling her in on what I know, and, you know, I'm still new, it's only been nine months that I've been here and I'm still learning a lot also, but --

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Is that it?

MR. JORGENSEN: It feels like forever. So, you know, I'm looking forward to working with Janet and keeping on going on the cleanup. Thanks.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: All right. Thank you, Paisha. Carolyn is not here so we'll move on to co-chairs report. Myrna?

VI. CO-CHAIR REPORTS

CO-CHAIR HAYES: No.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. I will then go ahead. On the Navy monthly progress report, we -- the Navy did finish the Petroleum Corrective Action Plan work in the Former North Building Ways Area at the beginning of May, I believe it was around May 6th. We excavated approximately -- well no, it's an exact amount, I was going to say approximately 3,400 but it's an exact, 3,378 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil, and then we backfilled that with clean fill material. Dwight mentioned the detonation of the items. Thanks for the pictures, Dwight, on the report. And in addition, the EE/CA that we have, the public comment period for Site 17 and the Building 503 area ended. The EE/CA IRAP, the final EE/CA IRAP will be --

CO-CHAIR HAYES: Could you not use acronyms? That's kind of way out there.

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Sure. EE/CA stands for Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis, and IRAP is the Interim Remedial Action Plan. It's a combined Navy and State of California document. That document is coming out final on June 3rd. In addition, we're now working on the next documents for that which is the Action Memorandum, and as well as the work plan to do the work. We plan to be in the field in September at Site 17. As the agencies and Myrna probably know, and other folks, we issued many documents this last month since the last RAB. There were 12 documents that were issued. They're listed here. There was a Draft Action Memo for Site 17 and the Final Field Investigation Summary Report and Vapor Intrusion Risk Evaluation for Site 17. So we had two documents for Site 17. The EE/CA or Engineering Evaluation Cost Analysis that Janet talked about earlier for the Production Manufacturing Area and South Shore Area was sent out on May 15th. We issued the Data Validation Report for the Offshore Sampling that was sent out this last Tuesday on the 26th. There were two Draft Polychlorinated Biphenyl Site Cleanup Plans, two specific Buildings 163 and 832, that were issued, as well as the Final Abatement Work Plan for PCB Site sampling. There were three tank -- Underground Storage Tank closure reports that were issued. And then a Draft Technical Memorandum assessing the Munitions and Explosives of Concern at the Production Manufacturing Housing Area. And the last document that went out, actually yesterday, was the Draft Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study for the Marine Corps Firing Range. We had our BCT meeting today before the RAB meeting. And that's it as far as for my report. And are there any questions?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. With that, we'll move onto our final comment period. Any final public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR BLOOM: Okay. With that we'll go ahead and adjourn, hopefully see everybody on the following Tuesday, June 9th, for the focus group. Thanks, everyone.

(Thereupon the foregoing was concluded at 8:45 p.m.)

LIST OF HANDOUTS:

- Presentation Handout – Draft Engineering Evaluation and Cost Analysis (EE/ CA) for the Production Manufacturing Area (PMA) and South Shore Area (SSA) – Navy
- Presentation Handout – Investigation Area C-2 Additional Investigations: Fuel Oil Pipeline Segments – Lennar Mare Island
- Features within the EETP – CH2M Hill/ Lennar Mare Island
- Mare Island RAB Update May 2009 – Weston Solutions
- Navy Monthly Progress Report Former Mare Island Naval Shipyard May 2009